

CONFERENCE OF THE EIGHTEEN-NATION COMMITTEE
ON DISARMAMENT

ENDC/PV.374
6 March 1968
ENGLISH

FINAL VERBATIM RECORD OF THE THREE HUNDRED AND SEVENTY-FOURTH MEETING

held at the Palais des Nations, Geneva,
on Wednesday, 6 March 1968, at 10.30 a.m.

THE UNIVERSITY
OF MICHIGAN

APR 23 1968

DOCUMENT
COLLECTION

Chairman:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER

(United States of America)

GE.68-3782

68-07804

PRESENT AT THE TABLE

Brazil:

Mr. J.A. de ARAUJO CASTRO
Mr. C.A. de SOUZA e SILVA
Mr. A. da COSTA GUIMARAES
Mr. O. MUNIZ OLIVA

Bulgaria:

Mr. K. CHRISTOV
Mr. B. KONSTANTINOV

Burma:

U MAUNG MAUNG
U KYAW MIN

Canada:

Mr. E.L.M. BURNS
Mr. A.G. CAMPBELL
Mr. J.R. MORDEN
Mr. A. BERNIER

Czechoslovakia:

Mr. P. WINKLER
Mr. T. LAHODA
Mr. V. VAJNAR

Ethiopia:

Mr. A. ZELLEKE
Mr. B. ASSFAW

India:

Mr. M.A. HUSAIN
Mr. N. KRISHNAN
Mr. K.P. JAIN

Italy:

Mr. R. CARACCILO
Mr. G.P. TOZZOLI
Mr. E. FRANCO
Mr. R. BERLENGHI

Mexico:

Mr. A. GOMEZ ROBLEDO
Mr. A. CARRANCO AVILA

Nigeria:

Alhaji SULE KOLO
Mr. B.O. TONWE

Poland:

Mr. M. BLUSZTAJN
Mr. E. STANIEWSKI
Mr. S. DABROWA

Romania:

Mr. C. GEORGESCO
Mr. A. COROIANU
Mrs. F. DINU

Sweden:

Mr. A. EDELSTAM
Mr. M. STAHL
Mr. R. BOMAN

Union of Soviet Socialist
Republics:

Mr. A.A. ROSHCHIN
Mr. V.V. SHUSTOV
Mr. V.B. TOULINOV

United Arab Republic:

Mr. H. KHALLAF
Mr. O. SIRRY
Mr. M. SHAKER

United Kingdom:

Mr. I.F. PORTER
Mr. R.I.T. CROMARTIE

United States of America:

Mr. W.C. FOSTER
Mr. S. DePALMA
Mr. L.D. WEILER
Mr. C.G. BREAM

Special Representative of the
Secretary-General:

Mr. D. PROTITCH

1. The CHAIRMAN (United States of America): I declare open the 374th plenary meeting of the Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
2. Mr. GOMEZ ROBLEDLO (Mexico) (translation from Spanish): As we are nearing the end of our work, which is to be completed within the time set strictly by the General Assembly for the submission of our report together with the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the Mexican delegation does not believe that this is the right time to bring up fresh problems which could obviously not be dealt with in depth in the present circumstances and which would simply hamper speedy progress in the final stage of negotiations in which we now find ourselves. As I stated at our 365th meeting, the delegation which Mexico will send to the General Assembly of the United Nations at its forthcoming session will make a more thorough study of the draft treaty and express its opinion after duly noting all the observations and suggestions, including amendments, that may be put forward by other Members of the United Nations that are not members of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.
3. All those countries which are not members of the Committee have likewise a primary responsibility for the concluding of a treaty which, because of its contents, its purposes and its close connexion with international peace and security, is -- as I said on that previous occasion (ENDC/PV.365, para. 13) -- the concern of the entire world. Therefore, aware as we are of the need to make the best use of the short and valuable time left to us, my delegation considers that for the present it must limit itself to a few observations which may contribute -- at least, we hope so -- to clarifying our position on certain points in the light of the discussions which have taken place and which my Foreign Ministry and my delegation have followed with the liveliest interest.
4. If one could define in a couple of words what is most original or at least most characteristic in the Mexican position during the discussions of last year and this year which have been held on the various draft treaties on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons that have been submitted to the Committee on Disarmament, I believe it would be rightly said consist in the very close connexion which we have always seen between the universal non-proliferation treaty and the regional Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America signed in Mexico on 14 February 1967 (ENDC/186). In one way or another, with certain nuances or verbal changes but with an identical thought, both the Mexican Foreign Ministry and its delegation in this Committee have stated that anything that could be done with the object of securing the

(Mr. Gomez Robledo, Mexico)

widest application of the Treaty of Tlatelolco as soon as possible, with its two additional Protocols, would be bound to accelerate the process of concluding a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons. Indeed, both instruments pursue substantially the same objectives, even though the Latin-American instrument, because of the privileged conditions which fortunately exist in Latin America, has been able to go further and is more complete than what, for obvious reasons, can be achieved at the world level.

5. Being clearly aware of this functional parallelism between the existing regional treaty and the draft world treaty, the Mexican delegation ventured in its statement on 15 February (ENDC/PV.365, para. 8) resolution 2286 (XXII) of the General Assembly, which was adopted without a single dissenting vote and in which the General Assembly made an urgent request to Powers possessing nuclear weapons "to sign and ratify Additional Protocol II of the Treaty as soon as possible" (ENDC/210).

6. Furthermore, the Mexican delegation is firmly convinced that not only is there a fundamental identity of purpose between the two instruments to which I have just referred, but also that, in spite of the difference between the methods required in dealing with a situation on the universal and on the regional level, there is also a basic harmony between the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons submitted to this Committee by the delegations of the United States and the Soviet Union on 18 January (ENDC/192/Rev.1, 193/Rev.1). For this reason, and so that it may be seen in relation to certain points on which there might still exist some doubt or controversy, my delegation deems it necessary to refer once again to the question of nuclear explosions for peaceful purposes as it is resolved in article 18 of the Treaty of Tlatelolco.

7. My delegation, as it has already stated in the past, does not consider this to be the appropriate forum or the suitable time for trying to make a detailed analysis of the provisions of the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America, which has been in force for Mexico since 20 September 1967. However, since one of our colleagues, Mr. de Araujo Castro, has referred explicitly to the meaning and scope which his Government gives to article 18 of that instrument -- which, as is known, deals with "explosions for peaceful purposes" --, I feel obliged to recall that the position of the Government of Mexico on this matter has been repeatedly explained both in this Committee (ENDC/PV.287, paras. 64-67; ENDC/PV.295, paras. 5-8; ENDC/PV.297, paras. 52-55), and in the First Committee of the General Assembly (A/C.1/PV.1504, pp. 62-66) and in the plenary meeting of the Assembly itself (A/PV.1587, pp. 42,43).

(Mr. Gomez Robledo, Mexico)

8. I will limit myself, therefore, to quoting textually two paragraphs from one of those numerous and ample earlier statements, taking them from the speech made in this Committee on 21 March 1967 by the head of the delegation of Mexico, who was Chairman of the Preparatory Commission which drew up the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America. On that occasion Mr. Garcia Robles said:

"... the chief merit of the Tlatelolco Treaty is, as I had occasion to point out in my previous intervention, that it reconciles the comprehensive and absolute prohibition of nuclear weapons, without any exception or reservation, with the rights of States members of the future Latin-American organization to peaceful use of the atom for their economic and social development. Both principles -- that of the prohibition and that of the use -- are embodied in the Treaty. However, whereas the prohibition (article I) is absolute and unconditional, the use -- and this could not be otherwise -- is subject under articles 17 and 18 to the condition that it may not involve a violation or breach of that unrestricted prohibition.

"A system of effective international control (articles 12-16, article 18, paragraphs 2 and 3) and an objective definition (article 5), for the purpose of the Treaty, of 'nuclear weapons' -- from which the Preparatory Commission deleted at its fourth session the subjective element of intention which had been included in the draft prepared at its third session -- guarantee effectively and adequately that the relevant provisions of the Treaty may not be overtly or covertly violated and in particular that it will be impossible, under the pretext of carrying out explosions for peaceful purposes, to attempt to test or manufacture nuclear weapons." (ENDC/PV.295, paras. 7, 8)

9. In other words, the Government of Mexico considers that in order that one of the States Parties to the Treaty of Tlatelolco may carry out a nuclear explosion for peaceful purposes, it will have to show previously that such explosion will not require a "nuclear weapon", that is to say, in accordance with the objective definition of article 5 of the Treaty, "any device which is capable of releasing nuclear energy in an uncontrolled manner and which has a group of characteristics that are appropriate for use for warlike purposes". In view of the objective character of that definition, the experts in this field will very easily be able to say whether such a thing is possible at present or not.

(Mr. Gomez Robledo, Mexico)

10. In this way, as the Mexican Foreign Ministry has stated on many occasions directly or through its representatives in appropriate international bodies, the Treaty of Tlatelolco has endeavoured to reconcile the right of Latin-American States to the use of nuclear energy for peaceful purposes with the absolute prohibition of nuclear weapons without any exception. When referring to hypothetical cases of conflict between one requirement and the other at the meeting of this Committee on 21 February 1967, Mr. Garcia Robles made the following statement:

"In all probability, apart from the merit of the texts which finally obtained general approval, this problem will never arise in practice in such a way as to imply an option. But if it did, and if unfortunately it were necessary to choose between the manufacture of nuclear devices which, though intended for peaceful purposes, were basically identical with nuclear weapons, and the renunciation of all nuclear explosions as the only means of avoiding the proliferation of those terrible weapons of mass destruction, the spirit which pervades the Treaty and is expressed in the Preamble clearly indicates which of those two alternatives would be chosen by the States members of the Preparatory Commission." (ENDC/PV.287, para. 66)

11. Because of all that, the Mexican delegation is convinced that there is no conflict, nor can there be any, between the Treaty for the Prohibition of Nuclear Weapons in Latin America and the draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which we are now discussing, provided that both instruments are correctly interpreted. Far from conflicting, they can and must complement each other usefully and harmoniously for the good of Latin America, the western hemisphere and humanity. By the same token, there is no conflict between article 18 of the Treaty of Tlatelolco and article II of the draft treaty on non-proliferation. In this respect, and since we have once again given our interpretation of the former of those articles, my delegation deems it appropriate to state in regard to the latter of them that we understand the words "nuclear explosive devices" as synonymous with "nuclear explosive devices that could be used as nuclear weapons". Moreover, in our opinion that interpretation corresponds exactly to that given to those words by the representative of the United States, Mr. Foster, at the meeting held on 14 September 1967, when he said:

"In order to avoid any loopholes, the draft deals with other explosive devices just as it does with weapons. This represents no change in policy on our part from earlier United States drafts. We have always felt that nuclear explosive devices which could be used as nuclear weapons should be treated as such, and we so interpreted our earlier drafts. The change in language

(Mr. Gomez Robledo, Mexico)

resulted because others made different interpretations. In any event it is absolutely clear that, if there are to be no loopholes for the proliferation of nuclear weapons, the treaty cannot permit the proliferation of devices which could be used as nuclear weapons." (ENDC/PV.330, para. 6)

12. Turning now to the amendments and suggestions that have been put forward in regard to the joint draft treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons, the delegation of Mexico hopes that the proposals made by the representative of Sweden at the 363rd meeting (ENDC/215), and that made by the United Kingdom (ENDC/203/Rev.1) and supported by the delegation of Mexico at our 365th meeting will be accepted.

13. The amendments proposed by the delegation of the United Arab Republic to articles I and II of the draft treaty (ENDC/197) have been considered by the delegation of Mexico with sympathy. We have therefore taken note with special satisfaction of the statements made by the co-authors of the joint draft treaty (ENDC/PV.370, paras. 56, 86), who assured the representative of the United Arab Republic that the present draft in fact provides for the achievement of the objectives of those amendments.

14. The problem of security assurances according to draft article IV-A proposed by the United Arab Republic will, the delegation of Mexico considers, have to be solved finally at the forthcoming General Assembly session. However, we should very much like our co-Chairmen to tell us now the formula they are discussing, since this possibility was hinted at by Mr. DePalma on 21 February (ENDC/PV.368, para. 18).

15. Of the amendments proposed by the delegation of Brazil (ENDC/201/Rev.2), my delegation has no difficulty in accepting that relating to article IX, if it should be approved; nevertheless we have no difficulty in accepting the present text of the draft treaty.

16. As for document ENDC/218, which contains the additions and amendments proposed by the delegation of Italy, we have no objection to the addition of the new paragraph 2 of article IV, provided that in the second line we add between commas, after the words "to acquire", the words "in accordance with the treaty".

17. Since we have so little time, I have limited myself to those amendments or suggestions in regard to which my delegation has taken a positive attitude and which, because of the time at which they were submitted, my Government has had the opportunity of studying.

18. Those are the observations or clarifications which my delegation has deemed it appropriate to make at the present time concerning various aspects of the draft treaty now before us. On the document as a whole and in general, we have already given our

(Mr. Gomez Robledo, Mexico)

opinion (ENDC/PV.365). In our view, and as is shown by the internal history of the text -- in other words, the preparatory work --, the present draft, even though formally sponsored only by the two delegations which have submitted it, in fact crowns an amply-conceived and long-sustained common effort. Whatever defects it may have, like any human work in general, it has the necessary maturity to enable it, with all the amendments that may still improve it, to pass very quickly to the final phase of its conclusion and signature by all the States of the international community.

19. If for our part we expect that event to come about in the near future, unlike other delegations which appear to place it in the distant future, it is certainly not because we think that the draft has achieved the ideal perfection befitting an instrument of its kind, or even that it fully meets all the requirements of the historic resolution 2028 (XX) (ENDC/161), which is still for us the pole star that should guide the course of our negotiations now and in the future. In perceiving and realizing this partial inadequacy we are at one with other delegations, and the Indian delegation in particular, which have stressed it so strongly.

20. In particular we must again deplore, as we have always done, not only that the non-proliferation treaty will apparently not be accompanied by real, effective, specific measures of disarmament, but also that, to use an expression that has become familiar to us all, we are putting an end only to horizontal proliferation and that vertical proliferation is to continue, as Roman law used to say on another subject, usque ad sidera et usque ad inferos. There can certainly be no question of claiming priority for the verbal expression of ideas and sentiments that simply stem from the moral conscience of mankind; but if I may for once be allowed to quote myself, at the meeting of 17 August 1965 I spoke of this double proliferation and named it extraspatial and intraspatial proliferation, when I referred to the propagation of that evil brood -- for death and not for life -- whose progenitor appeared on that fateful sixth day of August 1945 "in the sky and over the people of Hiroshima" (ENDC/PV.224, p. 31).

21. The extermination of that abominable brood in all dimensions of space and time in which it can proliferate is still the unfailing goal of our aspirations. The possession of nuclear weapons, by whatever means they are obtained, whether by a country's own resources or by transfer, is an evil by definition, an intrinsic evil. But precisely because this is so we must take the opportunity we are offered to close, finally and for ever, one of the channels of evil even if we are unable to close them all or to eradicate it completely. If at the moment we can do no more than freeze

(Mr. Gomez Robledo, Mexico)

the number of the States members of the nuclear club, if at present we can do no more than prevent the multiplication of centres of decision of a nuclear war, that by itself would still be a real and incalculable benefit.

22. With a healthy realism, it seems to us, Mr. Spühler, head of the Federal Political Department of the Swiss Confederation, stated the following in a memorandum of outstanding lucidity:

"That a non-proliferation treaty is not a panacea does not mean in any way that it will be useless. It will not be a disarmament measure, but it will be a first and necessary step in the direction of disarmament."

We find the same spirit in the position taken by the representative of Mexico, Mr. Garcia Robles, during the meeting of 21 March 1967, when he stated:

"The conclusion of a non-proliferation treaty, however imperfect, seems infinitely better in relation to the basic objective we pursue than no treaty at all." (ENDC/PV.295, para. 20)

The present balance of terror is undoubtedly an evil which poisons all international relations, but the terror would be a much worse evil if it existed in absolute freedom and complete irresponsibility. It would be the law of the jungle, of the atomic jungle.

23. The statement made on 6 November 1962 by Mr. Aiken, Minister for External Affairs of Ireland, is still of great relevance, or rather of greater relevance than ever. He stated:

"In the present tense state of the world situation, with the balance of terror teetering on its base, it is more than ever of vital importance that the nuclear Powers should refrain from upsetting that balance by spreading nuclear weapons to further countries..."

"I would appeal to the nuclear Powers to separate at once this problem of preventing the spread of nuclear weapons from all other problems which confront them and to deal with it as the most urgent and the most serious danger facing us all." (A/C.1/PV.1267, pp. 58-60, 61)

24. The Mexican delegation fully shares these views of the illustrious forerunner and promoter of the movement which is now reaching its final goal. In accordance with this philosophy, Mexico will continue to make every contribution of which it is capable so that the negotiations, both here and in New York, may culminate at the earliest possible date in the final conclusion of a treaty on the non-proliferation of nuclear weapons which will meet with general acceptance or at least as wide an

(Mr. Gomez Robledo, Mexico)

acceptance as possible. Secondly, we shall strive to ensure that the non-proliferation treaty is followed immediately by effective disarmament measures, beginning with nuclear disarmament. Lastly, we would state once again that our collaboration, along the lines I have just described, will necessarily have to take account of the basic interest of Mexico and all the other Latin-American States which have signed the Treaty of Tlatelolco, in urging the adoption of all those measures which are aimed at strengthening that instrument while avoiding anything that might weaken it, since that Treaty is the best answer to the needs of Latin America and the desires of its peoples.

25. For the time being, I will not say that it is the sword of Damocles that hangs over our heads, but it is something similar historically: the Ides of March. Neither great Caesar at the time nor ourselves at present can go beyond that. I respect Shakespeare too much to venture to translate him. I simply quote him humbly: "Caesar, beware the Ides of March!"

26. Mr. CARACCILOLO (Italy) (translation from French): Since there are no other speakers on the list and a certain phase of our work appears to be approaching its conclusion, permit me to anticipate the discussions of the next few days, that is, on the preparation of the report, and to submit on behalf of the Italian delegation a working paper on the subject:

"Resolution A/RES/2346 (XXII) adopted by the United Nations General Assembly on 19 December 1967 called upon the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, among other things, to continue its work, giving all due consideration to all proposals submitted to the Committee concerning non-proliferation and to the views expressed by Member States during the twenty-second session of the General Assembly.

In view of the short time separating us from 15 March, the date on which a full report on the state of our work is to be submitted to the United Nations General Assembly, the Italian delegation desires to make an initial contribution to the preparation of this report, at the same time facilitating the task of its drafters.

For this purpose, it has endeavoured to group, by chapter headings relating to the specific points raised, the various documents which reflect the opinions and proposals advanced from all quarters concerning the non-proliferation treaty. The Italian delegation expresses the opinion that these documents should be referred to in the report to the United Nations General Assembly.

(Mr. Caracciolo, Italy)

"The list of these documents, which is reproduced below, far from claiming to be complete, is, on the contrary, open to any additions and amendments which other delegations may wish to make to it:"^{1/}

27. I should be grateful to you, Mr. Chairman, if you would kindly consider the document that is now being circulated as a working paper submitted by the Italian delegation to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament.

28. Mr. de ARAUJO CASTRO (Brazil): I have listened most attentively and with the utmost consideration to the statement made today by the representative of Mexico. My attention was particularly drawn to his interpretation of article 18 of the Treaty of Mexico (ENDC/186). I have a word or two to say in that connexion. I agree fully with the representative of Mexico that this Committee is not the proper forum, nor is this the proper time, for indulging in polemics in that regard. We consider the Treaty of Mexico to be an instrument for peace and understanding, linking together all the sister nations of Latin America. For that simple reason, and in keeping with its spirit, we shall be very brief in our statement and shall not stimulate polemics. We do everything to avoid semantic explosions of such a kind, especially bearing in mind that we are nearing the Ides of March, as was mentioned by the representative of Mexico.

29. The representative of Mexico stated that article 18 could not be interpreted without articles 1 and 5 being taken into account. With that we fully agree. But we should like to know how it is possible to interpret articles 1 and 5 without the important provisions of article 18 being taken into consideration. That article was voted upon and fully discussed by the parties to the Treaty of Mexico. It would indeed be very interesting and quite revealing to look into the records of the discussions leading to the adoption of article 18, which was due, if I remember correctly, to a formulation presented by the delegation of Peru. At any rate I think that the most simple, least controversial and most direct way of tackling the question is to quote the actual wording of articles 17 and 18. Interpretatio cessat in claris is an old Latin saying, and in our view these texts are clear enough.

30. Article 17 states:

"Nothing in the provisions of this Treaty shall prejudice the rights of the Contracting Parties, in conformity with this Treaty, to use nuclear energy for peaceful purposes, in particular for their economic development and social progress." (ENDC/186, p. 24)

^{1/} The list of documents follows in the working paper, circulated as document ENDC/221

(Mr. de Araujo Castro, Brazil)

Article 18, which is more specific, states:

"1. The Contracting Parties may carry out explosions of nuclear devices for peaceful purposes - including explosions which involve devices similar to those used in nuclear weapons -- or collaborate with third parties for the same purpose, provided that they do so in accordance with the provisions of this article and the other articles of the Treaty, particularly articles 1 and 5.

"2. Contracting Parties intending to carry out, or co-operate in the carrying out of such, an explosion shall notify the Agency and the International Atomic Energy Agency, as far in advance as the circumstances require, of the date of the explosion and shall at the same time provide the following information:

- (a) The nature of the nuclear device and the source from which it was obtained,
- (b) The place and purpose of the planned explosion,
- (c) The procedures which will be followed in order to comply with paragraph 3 of this article,
- (d) The expected force of the device,
- (e) The fullest possible information on any possible radioactive fall-out that may result from the explosion or explosions, and the measures which will be taken to avoid danger to the population, flora and fauna, and territories of any other Party or Parties." (ibid., pp. 24, 25)

31. I should now like to say something about the document that has just been presented to the Committee by the representative of Italy (ENDC/221). We shall study it and consider it with the utmost care; but I will say immediately that our impression is that these lists are extremely useful and will provide us with elementary facts upon which we consider that the report of the Committee should be based.

32. We hope that the draft report to be submitted by our co-Chairmen for the consideration of this Committee will be presented at an early date. I would only emphasize that I hope it will not take long, for we consider it to be a most important matter; certainly the delegations will have to submit the draft report for consideration to their respective Governments so that they may receive instructions at the proper time. We feel that the report should be factual, simple and direct, without subjective expressions. If it is so, I think we shall make speedy progress in our work towards meeting the deadline of 15 March. In any case I should like to say that the working paper circulated by the delegation of Italy impresses me as being an excellent contribution to the carrying out of the work that still has to be done by this Committee.

33. Mr. BLUSZTAJN (Poland): I should like to say only a few words. I should like to ask the representative of Italy -- and I should be very grateful for an answer -- by what criteria this selection of documents (ENDC/221) has been made. On looking through the different items listed here I have discovered that they include references to documents which have been presented to the General Assembly of the United Nations, documents which have been presented to the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament, and also records of the discussions which have taken place here in Geneva. It is of course impossible to say here and now what is the relevance of the different documents listed here from the point of view of the study of the whole history of our negotiations. For instance, I do not know whether or not the document listed as item 2 in section A -- A/PV.1563 -- has relevance to the history of our discussion.

34. In any case it seems to me that if we embarked upon such an exercise we should, in order to make the list complete, have to go through all the records of our discussions during the past four or five years. That might, of course, be useful to some student interested in the history of the negotiations on non-proliferation; but I wonder whether it would serve any useful purpose from the point of view of the needs of those who will have to take part in the ultimate phase of the negotiations on the non-proliferation treaty at the General Assembly. I should be very grateful for a clarification from the representative of Italy before I make up my mind definitely on whether or not we should really consider seriously including documents of such a kind in our report.

35. Mr. BURNS (Canada): I have listened with particular attention to the suggestion made by the representative of Italy and to the comments on it by the representative of Poland. It strikes me that the representative of Italy, in making this selection, has included references to statements made by various delegations in this Committee and by delegations which dealt with the same subject in the General Assembly. These references go back some months, or even years, as the representative of Poland has pointed out; and it may be that the positions which were taken up by delegations, for instance by my delegation, here and in the General Assembly have since been modified because of the development of the treaty drafts and the various amendments to them.

(Mr. Burns, Canada)

36. Therefore I feel that, before a list such as that proposed by the representative of Italy were to be attached to the report or included among any documents accompanying the report, the references to statements expressing the positions of delegations on the various aspects of the non-proliferation treaty should be checked by those delegations themselves, and the drafting committee should be informed whether the statements referred to really represent their final positions on the matters in question.

37. Mr. CARACCILO (Italy) (translation from French): I apologize for taking the floor again, but I feel that I cannot refuse the kind invitation which has been made to me by the representative of Poland.

38. First of all, I should like to thank the members of the Committee who have taken part in this discussion -- that is to say, the representatives of Brazil, Poland and Canada. I believe that to be proof of the general interest attaching to this question. As I said in my brief presentation, the working paper I have submitted (ENDC/221) is merely a contribution by the Italian delegation and remains, of course, open to any improvement. At no time have we considered the list which we have drawn up to be final or complete. If corrections or changes are necessary, my delegation will be quite prepared to accept them.

39. All that we wanted to do was to remind the Committee that, in whatever way the draftsmen of the report consider most appropriate, the attention of the General Assembly should be drawn to a certain number of questions and discussions which appear to us particularly pertinent. We have, of course, tried to group them under chapter headings, basing ourselves above all on resolution 2028 (XX) of the United Nations General Assembly (ENDC/161). These chapter headings may be incomplete, and some delegations may wish to add others. All this, as I have said, is open to discussion.

40. I should particularly like to remind the representative of Poland that some time ago I had the honour of proposing in one of my statements (ENDC/PV.362, para. 37) that work of this kind -- an inventory of subjects -- should be undertaken by the Committee as a whole. If I am not mistaken, it was in fact the representative of Poland himself who was opposed at that time to this work being done jointly (*ibid.*, paras. 42, 48). That is the reason why the Italian delegation has wished for its part to make a contribution which, as I have said, remains open to any change deemed necessary. I should therefore like to request, as I have already said, that this document be recorded as a working paper submitted by the Italian delegation.

41. Mr. KHALILAF (United Arab Republic) (translation from French): In associating myself with the other delegations which have thanked the Italian delegation for the excellent initiative it has taken in presenting this working paper, I wish to make a few brief remarks.

42. In the first place, I wonder whether we have the material for verifying here and now which exactly are all the draft resolutions in the preparation of which our delegations participated at the General Assembly. I admit for my part that I should have some difficulty in making a complete list of the draft resolutions of the General Assembly in the preparation of which my delegation participated in New York. I therefore could not provide such a list, for which I have not the material at hand; and since time is short I do not think I could prepare it in the few remaining days.

43. Secondly, I wonder whether we shall really need such a work. We have been asked by the General Assembly to prepare a full report on the work we have done here in Geneva. At least that is how I understand it; and if a list has to be drawn up, it is that of our work in Geneva and not that of the work in New York.

44. Those are the few remarks I wished to make, while reiterating my thanks to the Italian delegation.

The Conference decided to issue the following communiqué:

"The Conference of the Eighteen-Nation Committee on Disarmament today held its 374th plenary meeting in the Palais des Nations, Geneva, under the chairmanship of Mr. William C. Foster, representative of the United States.

"Statements were made by the representatives of Mexico, Italy, Brazil, Poland, Canada and the United Arab Republic.

"The delegation of Italy tabled a working paper (ENDC/221).

"The next meeting of the Conference will be held on Thursday, 7 March 1968, at 10.30 a.m."

The meeting rose at 11.45 a.m.